

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, Dr. (2023)

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/B04+197 12/03/85 VERTANE	N . R	P418-566-095
ARMSTRONG, NIKAIDD, MARMELSTEIN 8 KUBDVCIK 1725 K ST., N. W., STE. 912	8 FRIEDMAN	EXAMINER S
WASHINGTON, DC 20006	1.25	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
This is a communication from the examinar in charge		12/11/86
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS A	IND TRADEMARKS	-77.10
This application has been axamined Responsive	to communication filed on	This actron is made tinal.
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the		the date of this letter. 133
Part 1 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART DI  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.    Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449		
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTG	D-1474 6	
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION  1. Jalms J-4		_ are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims		_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Ciaims		_ have been cancelled.
3. Claims		_ are allowed.
4. Claims 1-4		_ are rejected.
S. Claims		are objected to.
6. Claims	are subject to	restriction or election requirement.
<ol> <li>This application has been filed with informal drawin matter is indicated.</li> </ol>	ngs which are acceptable for examination purpose	es until such time as allowable subject
8. Allowable subject matter having been indicated, for	mal drawings are required in response to this Of	fice action.
<ol> <li>The corrected or substitute drawings have been recommon not acceptable (see explanation).</li> </ol>	sived on These draw	wings are acceptable;
10. The proposed drawing correction and/or the has (have) been approved by the examiner.	) proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of dr disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).	awings, filed on
<ol> <li>The proposed drawing correction, filed the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes of corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accord EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.</li> </ol>	, has been approved. dirawing changes. It is now applicant's responsible ance with the instructions set forth on the attack.	ility to ensure that the drawings are
12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has	been received 🔲 not been received
been titled in parent application, serial no  13 Since this application appears to be in condition to		on as to the merits is closed in
<ol> <li>Since this application appears to be in condition to accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle</li> </ol>	e, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
14. Other		

Serial No. 804.197 -2-

Art Unit 125

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as the disclosure is enabling only for claims limited in accord with page 1, line 25. See MPEP 706.03(n) and 706.03(z). "Administering" is broader than i.m. and i.v.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title. if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (q) of section 102 of this title. shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted facts of page 1. It would be expected that a sedative/analgesic wuld have activity in any animal. It is also noted that "mammal" broadly stated in claim 1 clearly includes any prior art animal.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title. if the differences between the subject matter sought to be

-3-

Serial No. 804-197

Art Unit

125

patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were. at the time the invention was made. owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chem. Abst. The compounds is taught as therapeutically old. The open form of the host is readable on the intended host for the prior art use. Accordingly, the claims are not patentable, the specific use notwithstanding.

The formula of page 1 appears in error.

Friedman:pw

A/C 703

557-3920

2/6/86

Stanley J. Friedman Primary Examiner Group Art Unit 125